

**DCSS P3 PROGRAM
CASEWORKER STAFFING
SEPTEMBER 1, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Friday, September 1, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Program, Caseworker Staffing Workgroup held its third official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☐ JoVonn Dailey-Miller (DCSS Analyst)
- ☒ Mike Farrell (DCSS Co-Leader)
- ☒ Patricia Gore (Small County)
- ☒ Brian Hocking (Large County)
- ☒ Betty Holland (SEIU)
- ☐ Cherie Karnes (Medium County)
- ☐ Hossein Moftakhar (DCSS Analyst)
- ☒ Deborah Mullin (Judicial Council); substitute Michael Wright
- ☒ Debra Olvera (County Analyst), Scribe
- ☐ Barb Sanders (OCSE)
- ☒ Kathy Yolton (County Co-Leader)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☒ Kathie Lalonde, Facilitator (SRA International)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Minutes were reviewed and approved with changes as follows:

- C.4: Cherie Karnes conducted surveys not Kathy Yolton.
- Cost-effectiveness ratio should be corrected as follows: "This ratio reflects the amount of money collected for each \$1 spent."

C. TODAY'S AGENDA

Betty advised that the guest speaker on union issues was not able to attend. However, the person she is in contact with will provide written materials regarding negotiations and caseloads for Betty to bring to the next meeting.

Steering Committee Meeting

Mike Farrell and Kathy Yolton reported on the 8/24 Steering Committee meeting. They indicated the meeting went well. No one questioned the 300-500 cases per caseworker recommendation. Most discussion was regarding Attorneys to Caseworkers ratio and how that will be determined.

Joint Workgroup Meeting: Staffing—Attorneys and Staffing—Caseworkers

Mike Farrell announced that a joint meeting has been tentatively set for the two staffing workgroups to discuss shared issues on Thursday, September 14, 2000 (the day prior to our next P3 meeting). The meeting will be held in the P3 Conference Room.

Other Housekeeping Issues

Jo Vonn Dailey has accepted another position with the state. Mike Farrell will try to obtain the summary of the other states' data from her.

Kathie LaLonde mentioned that Pat Pianco of OCSE Region 9 sent an e-mail citing two web sites that contain information regarding different variables that affect collections. The Workgroup members may want to review the information when they return to their offices.

D. CASES PER CASEWORKER

A discussion ensued regarding how to compare county survey responses and determine the basis for the 300 to 500 cases per caseworker recommendation. The group decided to create a table for comparison purposes. The table is attached to these minutes.

The group discussed how the proposed average cases-to-caseworker ratio would be allocated to counties when counties do business differently. Considerations discussed were:

1. Facilities – Infrastructure: logistics of increased space needs for increased staffing
2. Union Issues
 - Negotiation of caseload, meet and confer
 - Can't exceed negotiated caseload
3. Budget
 - County cost
 - State contribution/funding
 - Legislative funding
4. Case Type and Complexity
 - County flexibility to consider case type: EST, ENF, INT, and LOC vs. Cradel-to-grave
 - Bearing Caseload FSO vs. Non-Bearing Caseload FSO
5. Demographics
 - TANF vs. non-TANF
 - County income levels (median income)

- Urban vs. non-urban
- Seasonal workers
- Population
- 6. Legal Practice of Law (Attorney vs. caseworker)
 - Staffing—Attorney Matrix
 - Higher caseload if attorneys do more
 - Lower caseload if caseworkers do more
 - If the state determines that attorneys need to perform more of the work done by caseworkers, then the ratio will need to be adjusted
- 7. Vacancies
 - Ability to hire/retain skilled workers
 - Housing/cost-of-living
 - Employee pool
 - Pay scales
 - Funded positions vs. actual/filled positions allocated (data we used)
 - Unemployment rates
 - Extra staff for counties that have a higher vacancy rate
 - Factor in vacancy rate so ratio at any given point in time is the recommended
- 8. Level of Experience
 - Newer employees - may need lower caseload (entry-level vs. experienced)
 - Turnover
 - Organizational change
- 9. Clerical
 - How you use your use your clerical
 - How many clerks per caseworker
 - Define clerical support-to-caseworker ratio
 - Caseworker does casework
- 10. Automation
 - Lower level of automation requires a lower caseload ratio (manual)
 - Automation activates more cases: initially, need to have staffing to handle; thereafter, levels out
 - Training

Customer Service

Our assumption is that a lower ratio should increase customer satisfaction.

E. HANDOUTS

- Kathy Yolton: Style Guide for Workgroup Reports
- Mike Farrell distributed Hossein's Draft CSTAR Report Page re Financial Reporting, Cost-effectiveness for FFY, 10/98-9/99
- Kathie La Londe distributed copies of the individual county survey responses.
- Mike Farrell distributed table created by Staffing—Attorneys P3 Workgroup

F. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES

None

G. AGENDA FOR NEXT SESSION - SEPTEMBER 15, 2000

- Information from Hossein and JoVonn
- Set the cases-to-caseworker ratio
- Begin writing report

H. SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS RECOMMENDATIONS

None

I. ATTACHMENTS

None—see hard copy handouts above.

J. ACTION ITEMS

Action Item	Date Recorded	Assignee	Date Due	Date Closed	Resolution
Provide county staffing/caseload data including CS157	7/14	H. Moftakhar	7/28	7/28	Done
Individual members provide Brian with county staff job descriptions for their counties	7/14	K. Yolton, C.Karnes, P. Gore, B. Hocking, D.Mullin	7/28	7/28	Done
Survey counties - pilot	7/14		7/28	7/28	Done
Obtain Price Waterhouse (LA County) and Orange County reports	7/14	K. Yolton	7/28	7/28	Done
Provide county staffing/caseload data.	7/28	H. Moftakhar	8/25	8/18	Done
Obtain job descriptions from counties for county staff	7/28	B. Hocking	8/25	8/18	Done
Bring definition of caseworker in your individual county	7/28	K. Yolton, C.Karnes, P. Gore, B. Hocking, D.Mullin	8/25	8/18	Done
Provide specific 1410 data on staffing for next meeting.	7/28	M. Farrell	8/25	8/18	Done
Find out the systems each county is currently using.	7/28	M. Farrell	8/25	8/18	Done

Action Item	Date Recorded	Assignee	Date Due	Date Closed	Resolution
Compile survey results	7/28	H. Moftakhar	8/18	8/18	Done
Conduct surveys	7/28	B.Hocking, P. Gore, C.Karnes	8/14	8/18	Done
Send workgroup instructions on how to get on the IRG	7/28	K. LaLonde	8/25	9/1	Done
Share information in P3 staffing binder	7/28	K. Yolton/ M. Farrell	8/25	8/13	Done
Add data from Orange County, Kern, and San Bernardino to survey analysis and email to participants	8/11	H. Moftakhar	9/01		
Analyze survey results as a bell curve with standard deviations	8/11	H. Moftakhar	9/01		
Present CSTAR data	8/11	H. Moftakhar	9/01	9/01	Done
Arrange to have a guest speaker re: union issues	8/11	B. Holland	9/01	9/01	Speaker can't come, but will send materials
Obtain summary of other state staffing from J. Dailey	9/1	M. Farrell	9/15		
Obtain written materials from labor union representative	9/1	B. Holland	9/15		
Prepare "Caseworker Responsibilities" for report appendix	9/1	P. Gore	9/15		
Gather state handouts for report appendix	9/1	D. Mullin	9/15		
Draft Workgroup Report	9/1	K. Yolton	9/11		
Bring soft copy of all meeting minutes	9/1	K. LaLonde	9/15		

	Cost Effectiveness	Number of Caseworkers	Number of Cases	Number of Clerical Staff	Current Ration	As Reported on the CS157	Recommended Optimum Ration	Performance (FFY 1999 data)	How Cases Worked
	FFY1999	Sep-99	Mar-00	Sep-99	Cnty Survey & Atty Survey	Sep-99	Cnty Survey		
Imperial	4.95		10,932				500		
Tuolumne	4.85	7	4,225	6	600	600	200-300	At or above, except coll of arrears	Functional
Orange	3.81	383.5	106,099	190	355	281	300	At or above, except coll of arrears	Functional
Nevada	3.8	9	5,047	17	464	593	300	At or above, except coll arrears & P EST	Functional
San Bernardino	3.7	171	172,710	160.5	792	977	300	At or above, except coll of arrears & # of support orders	Cradle to Grave
Napa	3.59	10	5,452	12	644	582	400	At or above, except coll of arrears	Functional
Humboldt	3.3	27	8,978	32	560	333	450	All at or above	Functional
San Mateo	3.08	39	18,106	45	474	474	310	All at or above	Functional
Ventura	3.18	96	32,238	86	360	334	300	At or above, except coll arrears & P EST	Functional??